

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 remain pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

Amendment

The specification has been amended to correct typographical errors. Claims 1-8, 10-18, and 20-30 have been amended to improve their form and clarity. The preamble of claims 21-30 now properly embeds a computer program in a computer-readable medium to overcome the § 101 rejection. No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection

Claims 1-3, 6-13, 16-23, and 26-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Eldridge (USP 6,397,261). Claims 4, 14, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Eldridge in view of Wells (USP 5,999,601). Remaining claims 5, 15, and 25 were rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Eldridge in view of Adamske (USP 6,615,234). Applicant traverses these rejections because none of the applied references would have disclosed or taught the claimed delivery setting and delivery features set forth in independent claims 1, 11, 21, 31, and 32.

Independent claims 1 and 31 call for receiving means for receiving document information of a document generated from an external device, delivery setting means for making delivery settings for the document based on the document information received by the receiving means, and delivery means for determining a delivery destination of the document based on the delivery settings and for delivering the document to the determined delivery destination, which includes at least one of a server or an external device that processes the delivered document.

Eldridge discloses a system for authenticating mobile computing devices via tokens. Eldridge's system includes a token-enable document server that uses digital signatures to provide secure transfer of document tokens between the mobile computing devices and a wire based network. Eldridge's system functions as an interface between token-enabled devices/services and non-token enabled file servers so that a document identified in the document token can be accessed when the associated document is stored on a server file that is not token enabled. See column 5, the first full paragraph.

Eldridge's token-aware document delivery server 138 does not receive any document information of a document generated from any external device (e.g., file server 104, printer 102,

scanner 110, etc.). Rather, Eldridge's delivery server 138 merely delivers the formatted document to a driver or interface for accessing one of the document processing devices (i.e., printer 102 or personal workstation 108). Eldridge simply has no corresponding delivery setting function that provides delivery setting based on the received document information and delivering the received document to the determined delivery setting. Indeed, the passage (column 5, lines 34-46) relied upon by the examiner states nothing about setting the delivery based on the received document information of a document generated from an external device:

After retrieving and formatting a document referenced by a document token, the token-aware document delivery server 138 delivers the formatted document to a driver or interface for accessing one of the document processing devices located on Intranet 116 (e.g., printer 102 or personal workstation 108). The drivers or interfaces available on the token-aware document delivery server 138 include a filing interface 146, a fax driver 148, a print driver 150, an email interface 152, or a viewing driver 156. In an alternate embodiment (not shown), the token-enabled server 126 includes a document capture server, which stores and allows access to documents received from input devices such as scanner 110 and fax server 106.

Wells and Adamske do not alleviate Eldridge's shortcomings. Applicant thus submits that Eldridge would not have disclosed or taught the invention set forth in claims 1 and 32. Applicant also submits that other independent claims 11, 21, and 31, similarly define over the applied references.

Applicant submits that claims 1-32 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

25 AUGUST 2006

DATE

/Lyle Kimms/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. NO. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826

ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826

703-726-6020 (PHONE)

703-726-6024 (FAX)